



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

34
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,835	11/12/2003	Kenneth G. Carson	1855.2036-001	6925
21005	7590	08/26/2005	EXAMINER	
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C. 530 VIRGINIA ROAD P.O. BOX 9133 CONCORD, MA 01742-9133				RAHMANI, NILOOFAR
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				1625

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/706,835	CARSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Eric V. Woods	2672

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) Eric V. Woods. (3) _____

(2) Timothy R. Baumann (40,502). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 19 August 2005

Time: Noon

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's response to the Restriction requirement on 13 July 2005 was a provisional election of Group I. However, the response did not state whether or not it was with or without traverse. As such, examiner needed to determine applicant's intention. Applicant indicated that it was without traverse.